

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION MEETING OF
THE SPRINGFIELD CITY COUNCIL HELD
MONDAY, MAY 10, 2004.

The City of Springfield council met in a work session in the Jesse Maine Meeting Room, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon, on Monday, May 10, 2004 at 5:30 p.m., with Mayor Leiken presiding.

ATTENDANCE

Present were Mayor Leiken and Councilors Ballew, Woodrow, Lundberg, Ralston and Fitch. Also present were City Manager Mike Kelly, Assistant City Manager Cynthia Pappas, City Attorney Joe Leahy, City Recorder Amy Sowa and members of the staff.

1. Potential for Urban Renewal Districts in Downtown and Glenwood.

Economic Development Manager John Tamulonis and Development Services Director Bill Grile presented the staff report on this item. At the March 22, 2004 Work Session, council heard about redevelopment efforts for downtown and Glenwood, reviewed how urban renewal helped with redevelopment efforts in other communities, and saw examples of what worked in Medford's downtown. Council asked for more information about the vision for downtown and Glenwood and the process, commitment, and costs the city might experience to use this tool for achieving its vision and goals for development and redevelopment in these two areas.

The community has done substantial reports and completed work on how to develop and redevelop downtown and Glenwood. Based on these reports and community dialogue, there is consensus for a vision of downtown and Glenwood. However, progress achieving this vision has been limited, principally due to lack of resources and focused consistent effort. The city has insufficient financial resources now to underwrite and sustain all that could and should be done to achieve the City Council's goals for the redevelopment and potential for downtown and Glenwood.

Over forty-five jurisdictions in this state successfully use urban renewal, as authorized under ORS 457. As a redevelopment tool, urban renewal can accomplish objectives cities cannot easily do on their own. For example, with an urban renewal plan in place for an area, *tax increment financing* is authorized and future property tax growth is focused on achieving the plan's objectives. For downtown and Glenwood, these objectives are the council's very own goals. Urban renewal plans typically last about 20 years and terminate. Tax increment that went to the plan then goes to the cash-strapped general funds of local taxing bodies. A successful urban renewal plan would facilitate more private investment within the plan area than would have otherwise occurred; stagnant growth in assessed value growth downtown illustrates this point.

Attachment 2, included in the agenda packet provides a summary timeline for establishing urban renewal plans. If council directs staff to begin the process of writing urban renewal plans, a draft downtown plan could be ready in July for council action and community consideration this fall. Establishing urban renewal in Glenwood's unincorporated areas will require a partnership with Lane County. If the council wishes, a discussion with the County Commissioners could be scheduled to explore the opportunity.

To create an urban renewal district plan under ORS 457 requires a plan and a report on the plan. The plan can be written in-house by development staff. Needed, however, is technical expertise to prepare the report and to ensure all components meet Oregon law. The consultant cost is estimated to be about \$8,000 for the report needed for each area. Funds are available from Economic Development Reserves.

Mayor Leiken provided a video tape from KEZI which was played for the council, staff and audience. The tape included interviews of Mayor Torrey of Eugene and Mayor Leiken discussing the possible off ramps into Eugene and Glenwood. Mayor Leiken said this report was taped in January. He asked Transportation Manager Nick Arnis to give an update on the issue of the off ramps.

Mr. Arnis said staff met with local Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) staff. He said the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) ODOT planned to conduct on the bridge would be extended to include an interchange due in part to a phone call from Congressman Peter DeFazio. They should start getting consultants on board and committees going by the end of summer.

Mr. Tamulonis acknowledged Lane County Tax Assessor Jim Gangle who was in the audience. Mr. Tamulonis and Mr. Grile have been talking with Mr. Gangle regarding urban renewal. He referred to several of the studies that have been done regarding development/redevelopment in Glenwood and the downtown area. He referred to the options listed on the attachments included in the agenda packet. The intention was not to have a plan in place to be approved by any jurisdiction, but to get direction from council regarding a draft plan staff could bring to City Council for renewal. The Urban Renewal Agency currently in place in Springfield includes all members of the City Council.

Mr. Grile said this was a wonderful opportunity for the city to take advantage of this tool that has been used successfully by about forty-five jurisdictions in Oregon. Staff would like council to consider whether or not it would be a tool that would work well for Springfield.

Mr. Tamulonis referred to the memorandum included in the agenda packet as Attachment 1. This memorandum listed three options for council. He discussed the options listed. The investments would not be made from the city's General Fund, but from a separate Urban Renewal District fund. He discussed the studies that have been done for both the downtown area and Glenwood. He referred to maps displayed on the wall that showed how the refinement plan from 1999 was structured. He discussed opportunities in these areas and how staff works to make one or more of those opportunities happen as they come along. Working on them in this way takes a substantial amount of energy. Having an Urban Renewal District in place would allow more opportunities for direction. They would know how that could be done and what investments could be made. A good portion of the area in Glenwood has planning work already in place. He referred to the map and outlined which areas are annexed into the City of Springfield and which are under county jurisdiction. The County Commissioners would be involved regarding the area still under county jurisdiction. Staff would like direction from council regarding staff approaching the county about urban renewal. Staff has had preliminary discussions with Mr. Gangle regarding assessment issues and Mr. Tamulonis spoke briefly with a current and former County

Commissioner and they were interested in staff returning. He wanted to get council's direction before meeting with them further.

Mr. Grile said it may be helpful to ask Mr. Gangle to offer his opinion on the suitability of Urban Renewal for Glenwood and to comment on the increase, or lack of increase, of assessed value growth in downtown and what Urban Renewal might do in those areas.

Mr. Gangle distributed a handout from the Oregon Department of Revenue. Urban renewal is a tool that has been used throughout the state. The document he distributed showed the different jurisdictions using urban renewal and the tax revenue from 2000-2002. Mr. Gangle said the tax assessor's office collected approximately \$5.6M from the four Urban Renewal Districts in Lane County. He discussed the increase in assessed value for properties within the Urban Renewal District and how that increase is captured by the Urban Renewal District. He said this is a political issue. There are subtleties in urban renewal. It is a shift of revenue as the Urban Renewal Agency would capture the increase in revenue. There is an amount of tax increase that could occur in specific circumstances that relate to bonds. The effectiveness of the tool itself would depend on the amount of effort put in to the area, how well the plan worked and how well the assessed value of the actual district increased.

Councilor Ralston asked about Willamalane and how that would affect them regarding collection of taxes.

Mr. Gangle said any increase in the assessed value that would occur in the Urban Renewal District would usually mean increased revenue to any districts that overlay the plan area. Instead the Urban Renewal District would capture that increase rather than other districts.

Councilor Ballew said during the life of the Urban Renewal District, all taxing authorities would collect on the base rate set at the start of the district. Any increase would go to the district.

Mr. Gangle explained this further and discussed the gain by the other districts once the Urban Renewal District was dissolved. All taxing authorities would be affected pertaining to taxes within the district.

Councilor Ralston asked if this could cost individuals more.

Mr. Gangle said it could potentially be more taxes for citizens regarding bonds and measure five compression.

Councilor Fitch asked if Springfield was under compression.

Mr. Gangle said there is very slight compression in the City of Springfield. The school district is in compression.

Mr. Grile asked how much the assessed value in downtown was going up and how much it was likely to go up without help.

Councilor Fitch said it would be good to know both in downtown and in Glenwood how much the values have increased.

Mr. Gangle said he had not done a specific study, but generally commercial value in these areas remained flat. Opportunity exists to combine properties to allow growth.

Councilor Ballew said she is not a great fan of urban renewal, but we do not have a lot of options. She would like to see the assessed valuation and anticipated growth and what increases could be anticipated with a district. She referred to the presentation by Mr. Bird from Medford, regarding urban renewal. She would like to know what the plan is for a district in Springfield.

Mr. Tamulonis said staff would work on setting a framework with some specifics to bring to council regarding a vision or plan. Staff would be as comprehensive as they could and council could determine which option they would prefer.

Councilor Ballew said there was an interest in downtown and Glenwood, but staff was limited. She would like a sense of how it could be accomplished with staff support.

Mr. Tamulonis said the first portion would be to give council some options and look at a plan and timeline. Staff anticipated getting a draft plan to council by mid July. They would present some calculations performed by someone with expertise.

Councilor Ralston asked which of the two areas had the greatest advantage for an Urban Renewal District.

Mr. Grile discussed the advantages and disadvantages of each area.

Councilor Ralston asked if all businesses within the selected area would have to agree to a district.

Mr. Grile said the downtown business owners would be some of the greatest beneficiaries of urban renewal.

Mr. Tamulonis said they would not need to do anything. They would see no difference in terms of taxes. They would see consistent investment in terms of programs and projects that might enhance the downtown development. He discussed some of the programs that have been used in the past and the inconsistencies in those programs. An Urban Renewal District would allow the programs to stay in place long enough to have a substantial impact. The business owners would see no difference in the taxes they would pay. The income stream from the businesses within the district would be split.

Councilor Ralston asked if this would require a vote of the citizens.

Mr. Tamulonis said according to the City Charter it would require a vote.

Councilor Ralston said he does not approve of subsidies. The city could convince him of the value of this district, but it would also have to convince the citizens. He said he was interested to see what could be done. The final decision would be up to the citizens.

Mr. Tamulonis clarified that staff and the city would provide information, but would not be campaigning for a district.

Mr. Kelly said if council authorized staff to go forward with this, they would bring a plan back to council in July. At that time, council would need to agree by consensus that the plan would be worth putting to the vote. If they agreed it was worthwhile, council would pass a resolution with a ballot title to send to Lane County and essentially put in on the November ballot. If council did not approve of the plan brought to them in July, this would not go forward for election.

Councilor Ballew asked Mr. Leahy about debt financing and voter approval. She asked if voter approval was needed for debt financing of tax increments.

Mr. Leahy said it was needed for debt financing. Discussion was held about council not putting out new things that voters had rejected in the past. One of the things that voters had made it clear was that they wanted to vote on debt financing, so that remained in the Charter.

Councilor Ballew said the vote was only needed if money would be borrowed and the tax increment financing would pay back the loan.

Mr. Leahy said that was correct. He discussed other options he and staff had considered.

Councilor Lundberg said she would approve of staff going forward with additional studies. She discussed the plan staff would be bringing back to council.

Mr. Tamulonis said the types of investment made by Urban Renewal Districts have an affect on the outcome. Glenwood has property with great potential for commercial and industrial development. He discussed infrastructure in the area and the growth that would foster.

Mr. Grile said if there was no significant growth in assessed value, there would be no significant growth in revenues to the agency, but there also would be no significant loss.

Mr. Tamulonis discussed the maximum debt of an Urban Renewal district as determined by the state. Staff looked at growth in Urban Renewal Districts through the life of the district. In the end all taxing agencies would benefit from growth.

Councilor Lundberg said there was agreement at the TEAM Springfield meeting that time and energy should be put into the downtown. She puts Glenwood and downtown together. A lot of time has been spent talking about this, but there needs to be a focus. The potential of these two areas needed to be determined and how that potential could be optimized.

Councilor Ralston said he would be more likely to support something for a shorter period of time.

Councilor Fitch said she would be supportive of looking at these two areas. She would also like staff to continue to include Lane County in their discussions because any recommendations regarding Glenwood would need county approval as well.

Mr. Grile suggested staff open a dialogue with the county regarding the possibility of establishing an Urban Renewal District in Glenwood.

Mr. Tamulonis said the timeline for the Glenwood area would be longer due to the extra coordination required with the county. They may not be able to get it on the November ballot, but could perhaps be ready to bring it to a vote next spring. This would still allow both areas to be included on the same year's tax roles.

Councilor Fitch discussed annexation of Glenwood residents into the city.

Mr. Leahy confirmed that council had made no decision on this as this was just a work session. Staff would go forward to do further work and bring this back to the council. No decisions were made in respect to the downtown; no decisions were made in respect to Glenwood; nor both areas.

Councilor Ballew affirmed no decisions were made.

Councilor Ralston discussed those who reside in Glenwood and the importance of hearing their concerns.

Mr. Tamulonis said one of the first steps staff was planning would include a public involvement progress. There are different perceptions of urban renewal.

Mayor Leiken suggested this could not be a 'shot in the dark'. There must be a business plan.

Councilor Fitch acknowledged there were a number of people in the audience who would want to be involved in this process.

2. Glenwood Riverfront Plan Implementation.

City Planner Susanna Julber presented the staff report on this item. The city did not receive any proposals from developers for the redevelopment of the Glenwood Riverfront. Infrastructure improvements such as sanitary sewer are scheduled, and it is critical that the regulatory framework is in place to guide redevelopment once the infrastructure is in place to serve the area.

The Glenwood Riverfront Plan has been an ongoing project and a top council priority since fall of 2000. The city has received Transportation Growth Management grants to develop a plan to guide redevelopment in the area identified as a node in TransPlan, along the Glenwood Riverfront. The intention was that a developer would partner with the city to redevelop the area.

Because the city didn't receive any proposals from developers, staff is currently developing a strategy to adopt a plan which will guide future development. Critical tasks include: 1) Prep

Work; 2) Amend the Metro Plan diagram and Glenwood Refinement Plan (GRP) text and diagram from Mixed Use Commercial/Industrial/Multi Family Residential to Mixed Use Commercial (MUC), Medium and High Density Residential, and Public Land and Open Space (PLO); apply the Nodal Development Overlay to the Project Area properties; 3) Zone changes; 4) Adopt internal road system; 5) Adopt conceptual drainage plan for the project area; 6) Planning Commission recommends adoption of Riverfront Plan; 7) Joint Elected Officials adopt Riverfront Plan; 8) Annexation coordination/strategy; and 9) "Gap Administration".

Ms. Julber referred to Attachment 2 included in the agenda packet and gave a description of these tasks. Staff estimates that plan adoption could occur by February/March 2005. Infrastructure construction is programmed for 2004-2006, as outlined in Attachment 3 included in the agenda packet. Staff is seeking direction in order to develop a strategy for coordination of infrastructure and development requests, which is the primary objective of Tasks 8 and 9, above.

Ms. Julber referred to Attachment 1 included in the agenda packet which outlined the pros and cons, and staff's recommendation on each of the following options:

- Option 1: Require a minimum development area, such as three to five acres.
- Option 2: Require a master plan
- Option 3: Allowing development without the requirement for a minimum development area or master plan.
- Option 4: Council adopts the drainage master plan and conceptual local street network; developers dedicate right-of-way through annexation agreements.
- Option 5: Council adopts Greenway setbacks for the riverfront area, rather than having each developer apply for their own Greenway determination.
- Option 6: Require the first developer to adhere to special development standards, in order to set the tone for the project area.

While it was uncertain whether property owners would support these options, it was unlikely that piecemeal development would lead to the type of large-scale development originally envisioned by council.

She asked council for direction on the options outlined in the agenda packet in Attachment 1 and the timeline listed on Attachment 3. She also referred to Attachment 2.

Mayor Leiken said a serious conversation needed to take place with the county regarding the transfer station (dump) located in Glenwood. This meeting should also include the Pape Group, Weyerhaeuser, and Sanipac. In order to look at developing Glenwood, that conversation must take place as soon as possible. Staff should also discuss the power line issue with Springfield Utility Board (SUB) and whether or not they could be put underground. Glenwood is an urban area and a transfer station should not be in an urban area.

Councilor Ballew discussed the refinement plan and the consultants that studied this area. She asked if staff would continue to pursue developers even though no responses were received the first time and if so, why.

Ms. Julber said they were still looking at that plan. The intent was to get a developer in a limited partnership to come in and negotiate with property owners, form some partnerships with them or take on the whole development area on their own. At the time the requests were sent out, the city had not yet considered urban renewal and there were not a lot of incentives to offer developers. She did receive some positive responses from developers, but no one submitted a proposal. Now with sewers going in, the riverfront vision and the possibility of an urban renewal, there are more incentives to offer developers.

Councilor Ballew said the plan had not been well received by the development community. We are pursuing a dream that is not going anywhere. She asked how we would know where to put streets without knowing who will be there.

Councilor Fitch confirmed that some were interested, but felt the city was not ready because there were not programs or incentives such as urban renewal in place.

Mr. Kelly said the limited feedback received was that there was a dream but no plan in how it was going to be developed. The refinement plan sets out the zoning, but still does not show a plan. The developers said they would have more interest once the city had an adopted plan and money for infrastructure. Staff would like to proceed with council's approval to develop a plan and with urban renewal plan for the improvement and how they would be paid through the increment value. It would be council's decision whether or not to approve the plan and adopt a plan to bring urban renewal to the voters. In the end the financing vehicle would be urban renewal.

Discussion was held regarding the area where industrial zoning would be changed.

Councilor Fitch asked if there could be a potential loss of value to a property when taking away a particular zoning.

Mr. Tamulonis said typically the commercial property was several times higher than industrial.

Councilor Fitch said under such a plan if a current property owner wanted to continue the use they are currently using on their property, they could continue doing so until they redeveloped or sold their property. In either of those instances, they would then need to comply with the new regulations. Removing the industrial zoning could potentially increase the value of their property when they went to sell.

Ms. Julber said there was a shortage of commercial land in the metro area.

Councilor Fitch asked if this plan would be so well defined as to say which would be multi-family and which were commercial and who would get each.

Ms. Julber said that is something they need to discuss. They do not want to limit the potential for owners to make money on commercial property by rezoning it medium density residential (MDR). She discussed the concept of three acre floating nodes that were used in the Gateway area. Staff would need guidance on how strict to zone or if other options such as a floating zone, master plan requirement, or a three to five acre minimum would be preferable.

Councilor Ralston said since it had to be market driven, the more flexible we were the better.

Mr. Kelly said the issue was that staff believed some plan regarding types of zoning, types of uses, and minimum size developments should be in place before storm and sewer lines were installed. Decisions need to be made regarding standards and preservation of river frontage. Once sewers are in place, properties would go up and each owner could decide what they want to do without a plan for the whole area.

Councilor Ralston said preserving riverfront buffer zones was important.

Councilor Woodrow asked if any of the riverfront was set aside as a riparian area.

Ms. Julber said it was in the concept plan. There is a 75 foot no build zone and the next 75 feet is a limited development zone. That only encompasses the project area and that has not yet been adopted. If council would like to go forward with this, adoption of the greenway could occur.

Councilor Ralston discussed the sewer and if the lines planned would be adequate if the area were fully developed.

Ms. Julber said the lines would be constructed anticipating growth.

Mayor Leiken recommended looking at the pictures of the riverfront in Portland in 1972. It had changed dramatically for the better. He said Bend had also seen vast improvements to their mill district. These transformations didn't happen overnight. It involved partnerships with people who had an investment already or who were interested in an investment and working together to set a plan. Public involvement would be the key to success in the Glenwood area. He said staff had done a very good job in putting this forward and encouraging public involvement. Within our downtown corridor and in Glenwood, there was a great opportunity.

Councilor Fitch referred to the options listed on Attachment 1, page 1 included in the agenda packet. Regarding Option One, she would disagree and suggest it should be within the master plan from the city. There needed to be a big concept and within that there would be room for leveraging. She discussed several businesses that should not be included in a master plan for this area. Regarding Option Three, she would disagree and said that a developer needed to have a master plan. It would take council as a whole to say no one hooks up to sewer without a master plan. Staff and council need to act in a timely fashion so a plan is in place when the sewers are ready for hook-up. Regarding Option Four, she agreed the master plan needed to be in place. She agreed with Councilor Ralston regarding the setbacks as listed in Option Five. Regarding Option Six, she agreed that the first developer should be required to adhere to special development standards. This would set the precedent for the rest of the development. The first developer would need the city to work with them.

Councilor Lundberg gave her answers to each option. Option One – no; Option Two – yes, Option Three – no; Option Four – yes; Option Five – yes; Option Six – not sure. Regarding Option Six,

she did not want to make it too difficult for the developer. She would agree with setting a tone, but did not want to make it too restrictive for the developer.

Councilor Ballew said a master plan was nice, but expensive. She said a three to five acre minimum would be a good place to start. Without knowing what development will go in, it was difficult to know where to put the streets. She discussed different developments and how that would affect the location of the streets. The city has a refinement plan in place, but we do not have the funding to create another master plan.

Councilor Woodrow agreed with Councilor Ballew that it would be expensive for a master plan, but with the potential of the off ramps and the possibility of urban renewal, developers would look at this area differently. He said perhaps modifying the existing master plan would be less expensive than creating a new one. He gave his answers regarding the options. Option One – yes; Option Two – yes, Option Three – yes, Option Four – yes; Option Five – yes, and Option Six – cautiously yes. He agreed precedence needed to be set, but some flexibility must be allowed.

Councilor Ralston agreed that a master plan would work great if someone came in to develop the whole area at once. On the other hand, we must be optimistic and have a vision that they can all be proud of in future. He gave his answers regarding the option. Option One – yes, Option Two – yes, Option Three through Six – yes.

Mayor Leiken asked if staff could have the master plan as potential. Once more information was learned regarding the off ramps, it would be easier to have a better idea of the possibilities for Glenwood. It was good to be optimistic, but not too optimistic.

Councilor Fitch said she could live with that idea if the three to five acre development was within the scope of the master plan.

Discussion was held regarding return on investment and standards.

Councilor Woodrow asked if the sewer would be put in allowing potential for streets to be added.

City Engineer Al Peroutka said there would be a number of eight inch lines coming off the main line. Many of them were in areas where future streets would be placed according to the city's preliminary plan. There would be flexibility for location of streets.

3. Proposed Public Safety Reductions.

Mayor Leiken introduced District Attorney Doug Harclerod and Lane County Sheriff Jan Clements. Mr. Harclerod and Sheriff Clements made a presentation regarding the proposed Lane County public safety reductions for the budget year beginning July 1, 2004.

Mr. Harclerod's office provided handouts which were included in the agenda packet regarding this topic.

Mayor Leiken introduced City of Springfield Municipal Court Judge Strickland, City Prosecutor David Logan and Court Supervisor Kathy Cunningham who were present in the audience.

Sheriff Clements said he appreciated council allowing them to come and speak to them on this issue. Sheriff Clements said he spent 25 years in Eugene as a police officer and had a good sense of the criminal justice system at all levels. He distributed information to the council that outlined the proposed reductions from the Lane County Sheriff's Office for FY2004/2005. He is a separate elected law enforcement official and he expressed that he was not asking for any money from the City of Springfield's General Fund. He said that would not be appropriate. He said he would like a collective understanding by Springfield elected officials and staff of the public safety system deficits. He would ask for a collaborative push to influence county priorities in the short term, during this current budget cycle, as well as the intermediate and long term.

Sheriff Clements said Springfield could double the number of officers in Springfield, but for every officer in place there would be a diminishing return on the value of what they could produce in terms of enforcement activities if the rest of the system was broken. Any treatment or intervention programs designed to allow people to reenter society in a productive manner are ineffective because there is not enough funding to enforce if they fail. The problem the county is facing is similar to that of Springfield. He discussed the rise in costs versus incoming revenues. Until the system is right sized, meaning adequate jail and correctional space, adequate prosecutorial capacity, adequate programs, adequate supervision through parole and probation, and adequate youth services, the law cannot get a handle on what's going on. Springfield officials need to realize their public safety enterprise is dependent on Lane County's county-wide criminal justice system health. Eugene Council, Springfield Council, judges and others need to coalesce around a plan to adequately resource the juvenile and adult systems so officers could make a difference. He believes there would be short-term, intermediate and long-term solutions. He referred to the handout he distributed to councilors. He discussed the budget cuts they were facing and how some of those figures were determined. The cuts were devastating. They had to prioritize what was expendable, but it was very difficult. The reductions were in the following areas: 1) Domestic Violence Investigator, 2) Interagency Narcotic Detective, 3) Corrections/Work Release/Community Corrections Center (jail beds), 4) Police Patrol, 5) SWAT Team, 6) Helicopter Maintenance, 7) Transport Deputy, and 8) Sheriff's Office Support Staff. He discussed the loss of staffing in these programs and the effect these losses would have on crime in our area.

Sheriff Clements said these cuts were taking us in the wrong direction in Lane County. It is an interdependent system and livability would suffer because of this. When people look to move to this community, they look at the amenities plus education and public safety. One leg is ready to collapse and that may cause us to lose on the economic front as well.

Mr. Harclerod said Lane County has approximately 400 police officers who do a good job of arresting people. Eight thousand criminal cases are brought to the District Attorney's (DA) office each year. That is after Springfield adopted a state code to take on all Springfield misdemeanors. There are currently twenty-five lawyer positions including himself in the District Attorney's office, however, Mr. Harclerod does not carry much of a caseload anymore. He referred to a recent study from the American Prosecutor's Research Institute which studied over seventy-six district

attorney's offices around the country. This study showed Lane County should have thirty-two lawyers and is short about seven secretaries. His office has been able to get things done by implementing quick disposition programs. Under the current budget there would be nineteen lawyers left to handle this caseload, and that is not adequate to deal with 8000 criminal cases. That is a nineteen percent cut from DA's office, in part because they are losing some revenues. He noted that their office used 18.86 percent of the county's General Fund budget this year. He discussed the Interagency Narcotic Enforcement Team (INET) which has been very successful. Unfortunately, this drug enforcement program will be closed due to these budget cuts. He discussed the high rate of methamphetamine manufacturing in this area which led to the formation of INET. He discussed further results from the research study relating to number of lawyers needed to process the murders and serious assaults. Mr. Harclerod discussed prioritizing the list of crimes, with person crimes at the forefront followed by domestic violence crimes. They treat these cases seriously. There were sixty-eight felony domestic violence cases in Springfield in 2003. The DA's office continues to take care of those felony cases as well as misdemeanor assault cases. The DA's office would also continue to handle drunk driving cases. He provided council with a handout showing the impact of a million dollar budget reduction for the Lane County District Attorney's Office. He explained how these cuts would affect the DA office's ability to assist victims and prosecute crimes.

Mr. Harclerod and Sheriff Clements have visited city councils within the county to educate them on the severity of these cuts. They asked council members to contact the County Commissioner from Springfield and other County Commissioners regarding the concern over these cuts. Mr. Harclerod said there are over six hundred drug charges from the City of Springfield, which equals over two hundred felony drug offenders that the DA's office would no longer be able to prosecute. The budget decision would be made in the next ten days.

Councilor Ralston asked the sheriff about the cost of the domestic violence investigator. He also asked if those who use the search and rescue helicopter are charged.

Mr. Clements addressed his questions. He also noted that it is difficult to charge for use of the search and rescue equipment because it could cause someone to delay in calling which increases their risk.

Councilor Ralston said he likes to leverage things and felt the victim advocate should be a priority. He asked if the Human Services Commission could take over those services. He asked about the large reductions public safety is taking compared to other departments.

Mr. Harclerod said the commissioners directed staff to take a nine percent, across the board reduction. He discussed the added losses caused by revenue losses, which included the closure of INET, one-time money used last year that had to be accounted for, and lost money from the state. With those additional losses they have the largest reduction of all the departments in the county.

Councilor Ralston asked again if victim services could be tied in with the Human Services Commission (HSC).

Mr. Harclerod said the HSC has only \$500,000 to spend and there is a large demand for those funds and their services. He said they could ask for some of that money.

Councilor Ralston said he could advocate for that to the HSC. He asked if Springfield Municipal Court would be able to prosecute some of the cases that Lane County had been prosecuting.

Mr. Logan said Springfield could take some of those cases. He would try to deal with some of those crimes on a misdemeanor level. He discussed how some felony cases could be reduced to a misdemeanor allowing them to be prosecuted in our Municipal Court. Property crimes under \$1500 could also be prosecuted by the Municipal Court. He would remain optimistic.

Mr. Harclerod said the breaking line between felony and misdemeanor for property is \$750. A \$1400 dollar theft could be charged as less than \$750 to allow Municipal Court to try the case. Drug cases that are low level felonies could be charged as attempts to make them misdemeanors. He appreciated all that Mr. Logan could do to alleviate the county's burden.

Judge Strickland said that if Mr. Logan prosecutes offenders and they are found guilty, the city still only has access to five beds in the county jail. All five of those beds are full all the time. It is a daily task trying to decide who is the worst offender that should stay and who gets out.

Sheriff Clements said long-term solutions need to be found. He discussed several options. He agreed that the city should not be forced to pay for the jail beds. That should be the county's responsibility. The priority should be put back on public safety in Lane County. No solution set has yet been found.

Councilor Ballew appreciated Mr. Harclerod and Sheriff Clements coming to meet with council in person to discuss these issues. She discussed public finance in all jurisdictions. She asked Sheriff Clements if he had been able to garner any Federal funds for the AIRS.

Sheriff Clements said he had not heard anything yet regarding the AIRS project funding. They have garnered a grant from Oregon Emergency Management that is passed through from Department of Homeland Security. Springfield Fire and Life Safety also garnered some funding from that grant. He said federally things are also difficult due to the war deficit and deficit in general. He would remain in contact with the federal agencies regarding grants funding.

Councilor Ballew asked Mr. Harclerod if by law they were required to prosecute these cases.

Mr. Harclerod said he was required by law to prosecute crimes that come to his attention. He discussed the law and how it related to the DA's office.

Councilor Woodrow said he was concerned even if Springfield picks up some of this because it could then become over-burdensome to the Municipal Court. Council doesn't have a lot they can do because they cannot give money. He asked what they could do.

Mr. Harclerod said in the next five to ten days they could talk to any of the County Commissioners and discuss these concerns with them. There are tough choices to be made regarding the county budget.

Councilor Woodrow asked who else besides the county could assist.

Mr. Harclerod said no one in the short-range; in the long-range the state.

Sheriff Clements discussed Senate Bill 1145 which affected the funding received from the state and ability to detain offenders. Judges need the additional jail beds. County Commissioners adopted a strategic plan that public safety would be the number one priority, yet these cuts are being made. Government needs to make the hard decisions.

Councilor Fitch asked how many total beds were in the county jail.

Sheriff Clements said there were 485 beds in the jail, 366 were funded and an additional 26 would be lost with the proposed budget reductions.

Councilor Fitch asked how many of the 366 jail beds were leased to federal and state.

Sheriff Clements said they lease fifty to the U.S. Marshall's service, who has put \$1M into capital construction along with SB 1145 facility. They also pay a higher rate than the state which helps to subsidize some of the operations. They lease between 150 and 200 to the state.

Councilor Fitch asked about the matrixing system.

Sheriff Clements gave a brief summary of the matrixing system. It is very complex. The county hopes to move to a system called The Defendant/Defender Management Center whereby the matrix would be discontinued. If they had capacity, they would be able to hold on to many of those who would be released. They hope those going out the door in the future would have some type of accountability. He said 119 jail beds are closed due to lack of funding.

Councilor Fitch asked if staff running the jail were sworn officers.

Sheriff Clements said officers that provide security are sworn officers. They have looked at other options. There are issues with labor unions, comparables and classifications. It is worthwhile to pursue.

Discussion was held regarding prosecution of misdemeanors in Springfield and the cost effectiveness of prosecuting in Springfield rather than in the county.

Councilor Fitch asked if there were more economical ways to prosecute.

Sheriff Clements said there are always ways to improve. It would require a coalition of all city staff, elected officials and the county to advocate to the County Commissioners for funding options.

Mr. Harclerod said in reviewing an intergovernmental agreement of the Public Safety Coordinating Council, he found that one of the things in the agreement was to review the municipal courts in Eugene and Springfield to see if they were cost efficient. It was found that Springfield was very efficient. Eugene has since gone to a system similar to Springfield and they are now saving money. Municipal courts serve a valuable function for the cases that are not as serious as the felonies. They serve a very good function in the center of the city and are more efficient than the circuit and state court systems. He said Springfield saves a lot on overtime having the court here in the City of Springfield. He said he appreciated Mr. Logan's willingness to expand and manage these additional cases, but he shouldn't have to do that.

Councilor Lundberg said she is always appalled the criminal justice system is so broken. The bulk of Springfield taxpayer dollars is going into public safety. She said the same people continue to be arrested and prosecuted and she would like to know how to get them out of the system. She would like to support the pieces of the criminal justice system that get them out of the system. They are incarcerated, but she asked how we could keep them from returning. It is up to the county to take care of the incarceration. She would like to see effort put into creating a different system to track people. She would like to see the Human Services Commission and justice system working together better because they do interrelate. The county needs to prioritize that part of the budget.

Sheriff Clements discussed the state tax structure and the county tax structure. In terms of county services, Lane County is the second lowest statewide. Lack of prioritization is also a problem. The common denominator to a solution is to have adequate capacity for youth and adult. That gives the justice system a coercive agent to cause people to complete the programs they need to function and be productive citizens once they are released. Without that capacity, judges have no ability to sanction the offenders and get their attention.

Mr. Harclerod described the bell curve showing the age of arrests. We should be investing the most in teenagers because they are the growing population of offenders. We need to do what is smart on crime, which means using correction programs that work. The evaluation on what works is behind here locally and on a national basis. One in every thirty two adults in the United States of America is under some sort of court supervision, parole, etcetera. One out of every 142 adults in the U.S. is in a prison or a jail.

Councilor Ballew said the public would not pay any more money. Her priority would be in supporting funding for more jail beds. They are on their own regarding the rest of the list of reductions. She discussed the felony and property crimes. Everything on the list is important.

Councilor Ralston asked about the effectiveness of the D.A.R.E. program.

Sheriff Clements said early research showed it was affective for the short-term, but not for the long-term. He has heard of more recent studies that are conflicting. They need to rely on solid research-based analysis.

Discussion was held regarding the youth facility that is only one-third utilized and whether or not use of that facility should be a priority, not only for the consequence it would provide for the youth, but also because it could be economical to run at full capacity.

Sheriff Clements discussed the dangers of releasing some adult prisoners into the community to free up beds for youth offenders. He agreed more youth beds should be used and there could be money in the county budget for that purpose.

Councilor Fitch said a bad message is being sent out to the public regarding their safety.

Mayor Leiken said council understands there are issues out of the sheriff and DA's control. He appreciated them coming to discuss this with council. He said there is a severe credibility issue with the county, which is not the fault of Mr. Harclerod and Sheriff Clements. The county has intervened in city business and that has caused some issues. If they are serious about sitting down and looking at being creative, the Springfield City Council would be one of their better advocates. Springfield has been working hard to come up with options and creative solutions. He discussed frustration over Sheriff vehicles patrolling inside city limits within the city's jurisdiction.

Sheriff Clements said patrol officers on city streets could be a traffic team situation, although they should not be inside city limits. That does not take away from their rural patrols, but there is an image issue. They have cars serving civil process in Eugene and Springfield. He said he would discuss this with his patrol officers.

Mayor Leiken asked Mr. Harclerod if he or some of his senior staff would be trying more cases with the reduction in lawyers. He said Mr. Harclerod probably does not try as many cases because he is the administrator and there is not an expectation that he should take on an additional case load. He said he was talking short-term. He discussed whether or not it would be effective for councilors to call County Commissioners regarding this issue. Springfield would be willing to work with them on long-term solutions. He hoped that Sheriff Clements, although near retirement, would continue to be involved with the process of finding solutions.

Mr. Harclerod said he could try some additional cases, but the number of cases that actually go to trial is small. They tried 128 jury trials last year out of 8000 cases and about 50 bench trials. Ninety eight percent of the cases are going away in some other way other than a trial. There is not enough time to go to trial. If he took on more cases, it could make some impact, but he would not be able to perform some of his other duties. He manages the financial impacts of each case and makes decisions regarding other details of the cases. He is often there for large cases such as murder and other felonies. Most DA's from jurisdictions the size of Lane County do not try cases.

Sheriff Clements said there are two elements he has heard from the public regarding the special district issue. The first is if we raise the money that presently the General Fund is going to, we need to rebate that money to the taxpayers and then raise it to a special district. The second element he proposed is to go to the state legislature and ask for a fix that enables a separately elected budget authority other than the County Commissioners. There is one commissioner who was willing to consider it to allow them to get out of the law enforcement business. The citizens

could have a separately elected budget authority by putting on the ballot through an initiative process. This would be similar to rural fire districts with separately elected budget authority. He discussed the instability of using levies to fund programs and services

Mayor Leiken said members of the Springfield City Council would contact the County Commissioners regarding this issue.

Councilor Fitch thanked Mr. Harclerod and Sheriff Clements for their presentation. She also thanked our city prosecutors and municipal court for being an efficiently run organization in Springfield.

Sheriff Clements thanked the Mayor and council for allowing them to come to discuss this issue with them.

4. 2000-2003 Springfield Residential Land Monitoring Report.

City Planner Kay Bork presented the staff report on this item. Ms. Bork distributed the 2003 Springfield RLS Monitoring Report. The Residential Lands Monitoring Report is prepared in response to Housing Policy 5 of the Metro Plan which reads, *“Develop a monitoring system that measures land consumption, and values, housing type, size and density. Reports should be made on an annual basis.”*

This report includes data gathered from July 1, 2000 to June 30, 2003 for properties within the Springfield UGB. The report tracks residential land consumption and housing characteristics for new development. In addition to housing characteristics, the report compares actual land consumption and remaining supply with projected consumption and demand for the remaining supply of land identified in the *1999 Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area Residential Lands and Housing Study*. The report also includes maps of platted subdivisions during 2000-2003 on the Residential Land Site Inventory.

The last report was published in 2001. This is the first update of the original report. During 2001-2002 the Development Services Department implemented a new database software system that tracks building permits and land use activity. During that time data was not available for reporting purposes. Since then data has been made available and staff was able to run the necessary reports to complete this monitoring report.

The reporting period is based on fiscal year therefore data for the remainder of 2003 is not included. Staff is proposing to change the reporting period to calendar year. The next monitoring report will be available February 2005 and will include all information from July 1, 2003 to December 31, 2004.

Key findings of the report:

- Springfield consumed less residential land during the period 2000-2003 than projected in the *1999 Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area Residential Lands and Housing Study*.

- Springfield built fewer housing units during this period than the projected demand stated in the *1999 Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area Residential Lands and Housing Study*.
- Springfield built more single-family homes during this period compared to other housing types projected in the *1999 Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area Residential Lands and Housing Study*.
- Springfield built at higher densities on Low Density Residential land than previous years.
- The average size of a single-family detached housing unit increased slightly in size from 1655 square feet to an average of 1699 square feet since the last report.
- The average apartment unit built in Springfield increased in size from approximately 800 square feet to 1,000 square feet.

There is no financial impact.

Ms. Bork said the report is a report on the residential land consumption by new development, zones changes and metro plan amendments. It also summarizes housing characteristics such as what type of housing Springfield is building and in what zoning districts. The report is not an analysis of development trends, but is more of a snapshot in time.

Ms. Bork referred to tables included on two documents she distributed to council members. The charts showed a summary of the report.

Discussion was held regarding this report and interpretations regarding economy based on the report. Eugene is not currently included in this report, but if they were added, Eugene's numbers could affect the results.

Councilor Fitch asked if Ms. Bork could tell from this report if there was still a 20-year supply of buildable land.

Ms. Bork said we are consuming less land on the whole. If Springfield continued to build as they have over the last three years, there could be a possibility that low density lands would be consumed. Metro plan has a range that makes it difficult to pinpoint. This is something staff would watch. They would be putting in a new database that would allow them to look at this annually.

Councilor Fitch said as they look at this annually they can determine if they need to expand certain areas so we have a supply.

Ms. Bork said it would be better if Eugene were involved to make it more comprehensive.

Councilor Woodrow referred to page 1 of the handout and the increase in the amount of medium density residential (MDR) land.

Ms. Bork said the increase was due to zone changes.

Councilor Ballew asked how the city would run out of buildable land if we are consuming less than expected.

Ms. Bork said we are consuming less land yearly, but we are developing single family homes at a much higher rate than anticipated.

Councilor Fitch said a prior council put an emphasis on higher value dwellings, which tend to be single family.

Planning Manager Greg Mott said a lot of the inventory was based on what the state economist said would occur. The state economist said we would have a decrease in household size, but an increase in younger families and older citizens. Those things would dictate the types of homes built. This shifted what was normally considered detached single family over this new market, without consideration for the drop in interest rates, the war and other factors. It may be four years from now that things would go back to how they were projected. Council is correct that we need to keep on top of it because if our assumptions are not following through, we need to make adjustments on those assumptions.

Ms. Bork said staff held a community question and answer opportunity for feedback on the report. They suggested incorporating those types of things.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 pm.

Minutes Recorder – Amy Sowa

Sidney W. Leiken
Mayor

Attest:

Amy Sowa
City Recorder